

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

February 20, 2001

6:00 PM

Chairman Lopez called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Lopez, Sysyn, Shea, Vaillancourt, O'Neil

Messrs: H. Tawney, D. Hodgen, M. Roche, R. Robidas, Alderman Gatsas,
T. Jordan

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Request of the Manchester Water Works for two (2) new positions (Utility Inspector II, grade 19, and Public Services Worker II, grade 13). Request being made due primarily to an increased growth of customer base.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Classification change of temporary, part-time positions to match duties, functions and titles of full-time, regular positions in the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department.

Alderman O'Neil asked can somebody explain this.

Mr. Tawney answered basically this is a housekeeping change. We are changing the titles to bring them into conformance.

Alderman O'Neil replied that doesn't answer my question. What are we doing? They were temporary and we are making them permanent?

Chairman Lopez stated it is a classification change of temporary, part-time positions to match duties, functions and titles of full-time regular positions.

Alderman O'Neil asked so temporary part-time is still temporary part-time and full-time is still full-time.

Mr. Tawney answered that is correct.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

A-Step procedure revision submitted by the HR Director for informational purposes.

Chairman Lopez stated as you notice this was to give the department heads a timeframe to answer the employees on their A-Step. What happened before is some of the department heads took up to 90 days before answering so HR has recommended 60 days.

Alderman O'Neil asked who is going to be responsible for enforcing this.

Chairman Lopez answered Human Resources.

Alderman O'Neil asked so if the employee is not getting the A-Step addressed by their department, they can call HR. Is that the proper procedure?

Chairman Lopez answered that would be the proper procedure and then HR, if they fail to get the information in turn will bring it before this Committee or go directly to the Mayor.

Alderman O'Neil asked how can we get word out to the employees on that.

Chairman Lopez answered we will publish that through HR via communication or newsletter.

Alderman O'Neil asked so all employees will get some kind of documentation that this is the procedure and process.

Chairman Lopez answered that is correct.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Expanded City's Flexible Benefit Plan increased limit on the Healthcare

Reimbursement Account submitted by the HR Director for informational purposes.

Alderman Shea moved to receive and file this request. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated I would like to compliment Howard on this. I think in reading through it you will find that it is a positive thing. It saves the City money and it helps the employees.

Alderman Gatsas asked why are we not offering the full complement. Why is it only \$1,500 and not \$3,000?

Mr. Tawney answered I was concerned at the time that there was a possibility that we could lose money also and due to the enthusiasm with which it was received I plan to up the limit next year to the full amount of \$2,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked explain to me how we could lose money.

Mr. Tawney answered if employees were to take out the plan for \$1,500 and then they were to leave our employment and had been paid the \$1,500, we could not go back to them and collect the money for the remainder of the year. That money would be lost to us as an employer.

Alderman Gatsas asked so what you are saying is that you are prepaying people before they actually show medical reimbursed accounts.

Mr. Tawney answered no. The way the program works is you start the program, the employee starts the deductions and if they have bills then you pay the bills as they come in to the maximum amount that they have deducted for the year. That is the way the program works.

Alderman Gatsas asked what about childcare or dependent care.

Mr. Tawney answered that is for the full \$5,000 maximum.

Alderman Gatsas asked so that is available to employees now.

Mr. Tawney answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why we are not going to implement the full \$3,000 now.

Mr. Tawney answered I started it at the beginning of the year, you have to make the decision and it has already started. We can't modify it until next year.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

New hire/termination reports submitted by the HR Director for informational purposes.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from the United Steel Workers regarding actions taken by the Chief Negotiator.

Chairman Lopez stated before we take action on this item, could the Chief Negotiator come up to the microphone please. I know that you are going to come before our Board sometime and give us a breakdown of different things because that is what we asked you to do before but when we have a dispute like this over \$60 couldn't this Board try to resolve it before we all run up to Concord in arbitration or is that in your agreement with the unions? It seems like a waste of time to go up there with X number of people.

Mr. Hodgen replied the fact of the matter in this case is that the union filed a petition with the State Board and then we are either obligated...the City did not file the initial petition in this matter, the union did. Then, the Public Employee Labor Relations Board holds a hearing and I suppose the City could default, but if the City defaulted then the positions that the Water Works did not want in the union I suppose would have been put in the union by default. As I said, the union filed the petition with the Board and then the City was, as I say, forced to go to the hearing in Concord and defends its interests. That is how this problem started and not through any action by the City but through a petition that was filed by the union in Concord. Then it just got worse and worse from there, but the City did not start this controversy, the union did.

Chairman Lopez responded I understand that but if the union would have said hey we are not paying the \$60 couldn't there have been some other way to solve this thing. \$60 seems like a...

Mr. Hodgen interjected now you have to understand that once we got up to the initial hearing at the PELRB, the hearing officer there ruled that we did not have a contract with the Steelworkers, which made quite a mess and so, therefore, as I tried to spell out in my memorandum to the Committee we tried to straighten that out by asking the union to sign the contract. After all, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen ratified that contract in December and we paid people in that union the new contract rates from December and in essence the union refused to sign the contract which meant that the problem up at the PELRB remained a problem. In fact, maybe a big problem that might have gotten us all to the NH Supreme Court. So, I told Mr. Roche and there is a copy of the letter in your package that unless he either signed the contract or told us in writing what his problems were by a date certain that we were going to file a complaint with the same board and ask the board to find him guilty of an unfair labor practice and order him to sign the contract. It is not something I wanted to do, but something that evolved because the union filed its petition in the first place and then refused to do the honorable thing and sign the contract, which they negotiated with the City and which they ratified and which the City ratified. As I said in my memo to you folks, the union is complaining to you folks about a problem, which they caused. If I caused a problem I don't believe I would come here and complain about the outcome.

Alderman Shea asked Michael Roche to come up to the microphone to get the other side of the story. How much did we actually spend in lieu of having spent \$60 what the total amount was if you have that figure?

Mr. Roche answered what he is saying was true up until a certain point and that point being November 15. On November 15, which is his I believe eighth bullet on his two-page memo, he said I refuse to sign. I agreed to the first two points, but my union was not going to be held hostage or the City of Manchester was not going to try to extort \$60 from my union. Therefore, 17 days later we went to Concord and the City, not only the taxpayers lost out on probably in excess of \$1,000 but they also paid the \$60 filing fee so back on November 15, it is just a smokescreen with the rest of the things he said but between November 15 and December 1 the City...they had five employees and you have all the names, the City Solicitor, Mr. Hodgen, Tom Bowen, myself and my Vice President plus whatever their prep time plus the hearing officer for the State of NH. We also pay taxes through the state as well so just locally it had to be in excess of probably closer to \$1,200 with the overhead. The City ended up losing so what he didn't tell you in his last bullet was that it was settled up there to the union's favor so what was the lesson that the union learned besides getting a double whammy being a rate payer, a taxpayer, living in the City and the Chief Negotiator does not live in the City and besides that we are forced up there with our lawyer and we pay dues and I have to pay my attorney. So, everyone loses big time but the taxpayers lose a hell of a lot more.

Alderman Shea asked if the union paid the \$60 would that be a precedent setting procedure in your opinion.

Mr. Roche answered yes it would. I would be the laughing stock probably of New England if they found out that a union paid for someone's filing fee. We have never asked the City to pay any of our fees nor would we and I have been doing this since 1982.

Alderman Shea asked, David, is that true. Would that be a precedent setting practice?

Mr. Hodgen answered I frankly don't have this problem with any other union and never have.

Alderman Shea replied I am asking you if that is a precedent setting practice if the union were to have paid this.

Mr. Hodgen responded no to the extent that a precedent binds anybody else, no it is not a precedent.

Alderman Shea asked has it been done before by a union.

Mr. Hodgen answered I have never had a case like that before.

Alderman Shea replied according to what he says it is setting a precedent by his particular standards.

Mr. Hodgen responded it does not bind anybody else so it can't set a precedent. Precedents bind other people. Mr. Roche's paying of the \$60 fee would not bind anybody else. No other union or anybody else that I can think of.

Alderman Gatsas stated let me understand you correctly, David. Did you say that we do not have a signed contract by the Steelworkers?

Mr. Hodgen replied we do now because as part of the settlement, at that second hearing at the PELRB when we settled it part of the settlement was that the union would agree to sign and I think in fact they signed the contract there that day.

Alderman Gatsas asked whose responsibility is it to get a contract signed because the \$60 doesn't...

Mr. Hodgen interjected it could well be said that is my responsibility but I cannot force people to sign.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you have documentation of you asking the union to sign that contract.

Mr. Hodgen answered yes. The folks on this Committee have a copy of my letter.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason, Mr. Roche, that you didn't sign a contract when it was ratified by both the City and the Steelworkers.

Mr. Roche answered yes there is.

Alderman Gatsas replied go ahead, I am listening.

Mr. Roche stated one thing is the modification. We were going to modify the bargaining unit, which in your memo states the wrong position. It states an Engineer Technician II and it was a Utility Inspector II position. That is just a technicality and not that important. Yes, we thought that would have hurt that case that was pending before the PELRB.

Alderman Gatsas asked did your members ratify that contract.

Mr. Roche answered yes, they did.

Alderman Gatsas asked so under your position when they ratify a contract it is your obligation to sign that contract is it not.

Mr. Roche answered when all of the terms are laid out. Not in these circumstances, no.

Alderman Gatsas asked why did we sign it. Why did the Mayor sign it?

Mr. Roche answered I cannot speak for you. I can only speak for myself representing the union.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think this Board ratified it and sent a message to the Mayor to sign the contract. I can't believe that you can just arbitrarily decide when you are going to sign and when you are not going sign a contract.

Mr. Roche replied there were things that were pending. Actually, up through June...

Alderman Gatsas asked when was it ratified.

Mr. Hodgen answered I believe December 21.

Alderman Gatsas asked when was it approved. When was it ratified by the members?

Mr. Hodgen answered I believe in late October.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. Roche, do you know when it was ratified.

Mr. Roche answered in November of 1999.

Alderman Gatsas stated it was ratified in November of 1999 and you didn't iron anything out by wording until December of 2000.

Mr. Roche replied in June of 2000 the duration and termination was finally resolved. That was changed and was not through the course of our negotiations. That was finally resolved in mid-June six months later.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't think anybody on this Board realized for one second that we didn't have a contract that was either signed or ratified by the union members. I think that is absolutely inexcusable. I will leave it up to my union member, Mr. O'Neil.

Alderman O'Neil stated the contract needs to be correct whether the City has voted on it or the bargaining unit. The language has to be correct and I think we have found over the years that we have approved things with incorrect language in them and I am drawing a blank but I am sure if I do some research I will dig some examples up. For me the bigger issue is I certainly agree with Alderman Gatsas that the bargaining unit has approved it and the legislative body, the Board of Aldermen has approved it. I think both parties need to get together. We have a history in this City of arbitration and mediation. That costs the taxpayers money, not just in these filings...the \$60 isn't the issue. I think what is more important and I think both of them sitting there are at fault. The time that they are away from doing their job and spending time in Concord is the bigger issue to me.

Alderman Gatsas stated I agree with Alderman O'Neil, as far as I am concerned any time that a labor agreement comes before this Board and I have the opportunity, I am going to make sure that if the ratification is in place that somebody sits down in front of me and signs it or they better get the verbiage ready and prepared before hand before it is ratified. Do you think the members know that you had an unsigned contract?

Mr. Roche replied yes, they knew. Actually, we never signed a memorandum of understanding, let alone the contract, which the Aldermen saw in December.

Chairman Lopez stated I think the point is very well made and that is why I wanted some discussion on it. Henceforth, if there are problems, David and Mike, I think you have to bring it to this body somehow and say that there is a problem so that we can intervene on behalf of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen or take it to the full Board and solve these problems before they just go out of proportion and time is wasted. You are shaking your head, Mr. Hodgen. Go ahead.

Mr. Hodgen stated more and more this Committee, I think, wants grievances brought before it and it has had, I think, half a dozen of them brought here so far. That is a mistake in my opinion. We have a contract, which says what the parties will do when they have a debate over the language in the contract whether the City hasn't done what it promised to do. I mean it virtually never happens that the City files a grievance with a union. That hasn't happened in the thirteen and a half years that I have been here. By the same token, if I came to this Board or to this Committee and said that the Steelworkers refused to sign the contract, I suppose this Committee or maybe the full Board would decide that there was no contract, which frankly was a question that I asked the PELRB when they ruled that there was no contract. Should we stop paying the new wage rates? Do employees owe us money back and all of those kind of things so the State law, RSA 273:A says that it is an unfair labor practice not to negotiate in good faith and to reach an agreement with another party and then to refuse, not mistakenly omit or something like that but to deliberately refuse after written letters giving the union fair room and fair warning about what would happen if it was not signed number one and then having a conversation with their chief negotiator about the problem and then having them not do anything about it and then having a telephone conversation with Mr. Roche during which he asked me for two more days so he could think it over and still he did not sign it then at some point either I have to do what I said I am going to do or I am wasting pen and ink trying to force the union to sign a contract, which is the honorable thing to do.

Chairman Lopez stated when you run into those particular problems and what I am trying to understand here just a little bit better, who do you take your problems to. The HR Director? A Committee? To the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen?

Mr. Hodgen replied these ordinance that established my position said that I am responsible for all phases and details of collective bargaining.

Chairman Lopez asked who do you report to.

Mr. Hodgen answered it depends on which capacity I am acting under and I suppose even that could be argued. I report to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen essentially as the Chief Negotiator. Now if I bring that problem to you folks, the outcome could be a lot worse than it was in this case. The Board of Mayor and Aldermen might have decided we don't have a contract and we are not going to pay these people the new Yarger Decker pay rates anymore.

Chairman Lopez stated I can only speak for myself but Yarger Decker was supposed to clear a lot of these problems up and since I have been an Alderman, I will tell you there are a lot of problems and I don't understand why. I think that there are problems out there whether it be the Steelworkers or the Highway Department and if there are problems that you are encountering I think you have to tell somebody and maybe they can solve some of these problems very easily. Now it would have been very easy to get you two here if you didn't want to sign and say, Mike, why don't you sign this contract and for him to identify what was wrong with that contract that was approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen because it is probably about that thick and maybe a couple of spelling things and a couple of numbers and that...I am just saying whatever the problem is somebody has to know this.

Alderman Shea asked, David, how come you lost up in Concord and you still had to pay the \$60.

Mr. Hodgen answered that is a misstatement. When two parties settle a controversy, nobody loses. Nowhere on earth when two parties settle a controversy does one party lose.

Alderman Shea asked did you have to pay the \$60 yes or no.

Mr. Hodgen answered I had to pay it to file the complaint. That is the law.

Alderman Shea asked so in essence you had to pay the \$60, which you wanted the union to pay. Is that correct?

Mr. Hodgen answered I had to pay the \$60 because that was the filing fee. You cannot file a document up there without paying a fee.

Alderman Shea replied that is correct and you wanted the union to pay you back for the \$60 that you had paid. Is that correct?

Mr. Hodgen responded yes because through their obstinacy the City was forced to pay the \$60.

Alderman Shea asked did the labor board then say to you that the union had to pay you back the \$60.

Mr. Hodgen answered no because we settled it and among other things we agreed that they would not have to pay back the \$60 and they would sign the contract and they would not file their modification petition again during the life of this contract. That was the settlement.

Alderman Shea stated so basically the end result was that it cost the City \$1,060 in order for...

Mr. Hodgen interjected no. That is Mr. Roche's opinion. It is not mine. We paid \$60 in hard cash from the City coffers. No debate about that, but whether I am in Concord at a hearing or in my office or somewhere else negotiating, the City pays me the same amount and the same is true for Atty. Muller and in terms of...

Alderman Shea interjected your logic goes out of place here because if you are up there arguing a case that you have to pay on and he can't be doing something else and if Mr. Bowen has to be up there and Mr. Roche has to be up there and the guy hearing the case has to be there, you are not talking peanuts here you are talking about money tied up with people having to spend time, David.

Mr. Hodgen replied I understand but that is our job. That is my job.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have to disagree because it is not Tom Bowen's job to be up at the PELRB. It is not Mike Roche's. It is not Dan Muller's. We have a problem getting...the attorneys are stretched out as it is getting paperwork for general City business done so it is not people's time to be sitting up in front of the labor relations board. Please don't make that statement, nor do I think it is your time to be sitting up there.

Mr. Hodgen replied Mr. Roche can problem tell you...I can't remember, we have had 12 or 15 grievances filed last year by the union. Should we bring everyone of them here to this Board when the contract says that we take it through the grievance procedure even to arbitration?

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I think we should move this thing along. I agree with a lot of things that have been said here including that it is not obviously in the best use of anybody's time to be doing something like this. I think what has happened here is that there is some animosity, there is some hubris. This has snowballed into a bad situation. I think I agree with our negotiator, however, I wouldn't have paid them the money if they didn't sign the contract. That is how I

would have been so I would have been a little tougher than you were. I don't agree with either of you and I wish we get on with this.

Chairman Lopez stated David we are going to have a special meeting with you at another time so you can educate us a little bit because contracts are coming up and we want to understand your job just a little bit better.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Vaillancourt, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Report of a pilot Wellness Program conducted with Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department employees.

On motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file this item.

TABLED ITEMS

10. Communication from Alderman Lopez advising of previous actions relative to ordinance amendments submitted by the Mayor, and requesting the Board allow the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance to review the administrative and financial functions of the City with an eye towards improving the organizational structure and efficiency of these operations and associated internal controls with a recommendation to be brought forward to the full Board.
(Tabled 01/16/01)

This item remained on the table.

11. Proposed Drug and Alcohol Policy to be applied only to non-affiliated positions, but will be a subject of bargaining with affiliated employees during contract negotiations.
(Tabled 01/16/01 - revised policy enclosed with follow-up information provided by Mr. Robidas.)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Mr. Robidas stated the Clerk should have handed out the latest revision. There are two minor modifications and it is just in language. We sent this out last week to

the department heads and we also sent it out to the non-affiliated representatives and asked for their feedback and with consultation with the EAP Director and the City Solicitor's Office and the feedback we received from the department heads, we made two minor modifications that I would like to point out. Under Prohibition, #5, what we did was added the words "consume alcohol or possesses." Previously the copy you had at the end of last week said "possess a container of alcohol with a broken seal during work hours." One of the department heads, actually Mr. Bowen, replied to the e-mail and said nowhere in this policy does it say you cannot consume it. It inferred that but it didn't say it directly so we added the words consume alcohol under Prohibition. The only other change we made to this would be at the beginning of Page 3. This was in consultation with Mr. Jordan and with the Solicitor's Office. We added the area of counseling, "an employee who tests positive shall be referred to the Employee Assistance Program for assessment". That appeared in the previous policy, but it came under a different category. Versus under Discipline it is under a counseling aspect of the policy. Those are the only changes that we made since the copies that you received last week.

Chairman Lopez stated I want to commend the Committee that worked on this. I ask the City Solicitor now are you in favor of this drug and alcohol policy?

Mr. Muller replied I have no issues, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked is random testing here at all.

Mr. Robidas answered no, Sir.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated why did we decide to drop it other than my wishes.

Mr. Robidas replied we actually went back and took the comments from the Committee as well and drafted a policy and came up with what we thought was a bonafide policy that we felt we could defend as well.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked did you find any other cities or towns that have random testing.

Mr. Robidas answered I believe we found...not in this area but I believe we did find Texas or someplace like that. Nothing locally.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked why were we trying to put that through in the first place.

Mr. Robidas answered that was to mirror the CDL policy, which was a Federal regulation and that would have only pertained to safety sensitive positions but we scoped that down even further. Under the Federal regulations on the commercial driver's license they do random testing. That is where that formula came from. It was to mirror that policy.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated the only positions requiring pre-employment testing are Police and Fire.

Mr. Robidas replied that is correct.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked why is that.

Mr. Robidas answered that is because based on court decisions there has been some debate on what is safety sensitive but there seems to be a very clear and concise pattern that Police and Fire are indisputable safety sensitive positions and, therefore, the Solicitor's Office felt we would be on very safe grounds. As recently as last week I looked at another court decision that came out of the City of Seattle and again they had random testing...excuse me pre-employment testing for all of their city employees and the State Supreme Court in the state of Washington ruled safety sensitive, specifically police officers, could legitimately be argued but that they had a problem with all city employees.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked previously the approach was much broader than Police and Fire right.

Mr. Robidas answered that is right.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so we scaled that back as well.

Mr. Robidas answered we scaled it back strictly to Police and Fire at the pre-employment stage and the reasonable suspicion the Solicitor's Office feels is applicable to everyone if the proper training is conducted and if the proper circumstances present themselves.

Alderman Shea asked will the school employees be covered under this policy.

Mr. Robidas answered they are a district and we didn't calculate them in this process.

Alderman Shea asked if they come back to being a City department would they be under this policy.

Mr. Robidas answered we would have to revisit that with the Solicitor's Office.

Chairman Lopez asked will this be an item of negotiation for the union.

Mr. Robidas answered that would be up to the City's position. If the City decided that they wanted that as part of a collective bargaining agreement, that would be at the direction of the City but as of right now the only people, because of the PELRB ruling that we can make this applicable to are the non-affiliated employees at this time.

Alderman O'Neil asked is Mr. Jordan fine with this.

Mr. Jordan stated I have no problem with this. I consulted with the Solicitor and red. This would enhance the City's position from a legal standpoint. I tend to refer them to counseling to get some help anyway.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted to approve the proposed Drug and Alcohol Policy for non-affiliated employees.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I think this is a vast improvement over that questionably legal and certainly immoral document that was put before us last time. I hope we never have to have such a travesty as came before us before and I do commend the City Solicitor's Office for holding out for civil libertarian principles. I am wondering how effective the pre-employment testing will be. Anybody who is so stupid as to drink a bottle of beer six hours before he is going to be tested or whatever shouldn't be hired anyway. I guess it is a moot point. I can live with this.

12. Ordinance Amendments:

"Amending 33.076 (Special Leave) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

Providing for amendment to Section D as follows:

"In addition to other leaves authorized by this subchapter, a department head and/or the Human Resources Director with the approval of the Mayor, may authorize an employee to be placed on administrative leave with or without pay in the interest of the City, for a period or periods not to exceed twenty work days in any calendar year."

"Amending Section 33.076 (Special Leave) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

Providing for amendment to Section D as follows:

"The Human Resources Director may recommend to the Mayor for his approval up to twenty (20) days of administrative leave, for employees, for purposes that are beneficial to the City. Such leave is chargeable to the employee's department."

"Amending Section 33.048 (Advancements within Pay Range) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

(Tabled 01/16/01)

This item remained on the table.

13. Communication from Mayor Baines relative to an Executive Summary of Welfare issues.
(01/16/01 - voted that the Welfare Commissioner position remain an elected post and tabled the remaining issues.)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted to receive and file this item.

14. Communication from employees of the Welfare Department requesting the Board review all options available and change the position of Welfare Commissioner from an elected post to an appointed/hired position.
(Tabled 01/16/01)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file this item.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file this item.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Vaillancourt, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee